

§ 774.5

23 CFR Ch. I (4–1–13 Edition)

(iv) The views of the official(s) with jurisdiction over each Section 4(f) property;

(v) The degree to which each alternative meets the purpose and need for the project;

(vi) After reasonable mitigation, the magnitude of any adverse impacts to resources not protected by Section 4(f); and

(vii) Substantial differences in costs among the alternatives.

(2) The alternative selected must include all possible planning, as defined in § 774.17, to minimize harm to Section 4(f) property.

(d) Programmatic Section 4(f) evaluations are a time-saving procedural alternative to preparing individual Section 4(f) evaluations under paragraph (a) of this section for certain minor uses of Section 4(f) property. Programmatic Section 4(f) evaluations are developed by the Administration based on experience with a specific set of conditions that includes project type, degree of use and impact, and evaluation of avoidance alternatives.¹ An approved programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation may be relied upon to cover a particular project only if the specific conditions in the programmatic evaluation are met

(1) The determination whether a programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation applies to the use of a specific Section 4(f) property shall be documented as specified in the applicable programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation.

(2) The Administration may develop additional programmatic Section 4(f) evaluations. Proposed new or revised

programmatic Section 4(f) evaluations will be coordinated with the Department of Interior, Department of Agriculture, and Department of Housing and Urban Development, and published in the FEDERAL REGISTER for comment prior to being finalized. New or revised programmatic Section 4(f) evaluations shall be reviewed for legal sufficiency and approved by the Headquarters Office of the Administration.

(e) The coordination requirements in § 774.5 must be completed before the Administration may make Section 4(f) approvals under this section. Requirements for the documentation and timing of Section 4(f) approvals are located in §§ 774.7 and 774.9, respectively.

[73 FR 13395, Mar. 12, 2008, as amended at 73 FR 31610, June 3, 2008]

§ 774.5 Coordination.

(a) Prior to making Section 4(f) approvals under § 774.3(a), the Section 4(f) evaluation shall be provided for coordination and comment to the official(s) with jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) resource and to the Department of the Interior, and as appropriate to the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Administration shall provide a minimum of 45 days for receipt of comments. If comments are not received within 15 days after the comment deadline, the Administration may assume a lack of objection and proceed with the action.

(b) Prior to making *de minimis* impact determinations under § 774.3(b), the following coordination shall be undertaken:

(1) For historic properties:

(i) The consulting parties identified in accordance with 36 CFR part 800 must be consulted; and

(ii) The Administration must receive written concurrence from the pertinent State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) or Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), and from the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) if participating in the consultation process, in a finding of “no adverse effect” or “no historic properties affected” in accordance with 36 CFR part 800. The Administration shall inform these officials of its intent to

¹FHWA has issued five programmatic Section 4(f) evaluations: (1) Final Nationwide Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation and Determination for Federal-Aid Transportation Projects That Have a Net Benefit to a Section 4(f) Property; (2) Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluations and Approvals for Federally-Aided Highway Projects With Minor Involvement With Public Parks, Recreation Lands, Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges, and Historic Sites; (3) Final Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for Federally-Aided Highway Projects With Minor Involvements With Historic Sites; (4) Historic Bridges; Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval; and (5) Section 4(f) Statement and Determination for Independent Bikeway or Walkway Construction Projects.

make a *de minimis* impact determination based on their concurrence in the finding of “no adverse effect” or “no historic properties affected.”

(iii) Public notice and comment, beyond that required by 36 CFR part 800, is not required.

(2) For parks, recreation areas, and wildlife and waterfowl refuges:

(i) Public notice and an opportunity for public review and comment concerning the effects on the protected activities, features, or attributes of the property must be provided. This requirement can be satisfied in conjunction with other public involvement procedures, such as a comment period provided on a NEPA document.

(ii) The Administration shall inform the official(s) with jurisdiction of its intent to make a *de minimis* impact finding. Following an opportunity for public review and comment as described in paragraph (b)(2)(i) of this section, the official(s) with jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) resource must concur in writing that the project will not adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes that make the property eligible for Section 4(f) protection. This concurrence may be combined with other comments on the project provided by the official(s).

(c) The application of a programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation to the use of a specific Section 4(f) property under § 774.3(d)(1) shall be coordinated as specified in the applicable programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation.

(d) When Federal encumbrances on Section 4(f) property are identified, coordination with the appropriate Federal agency is required to ascertain the agency's position on the proposed impact, as well as to determine if any other Federal requirements may apply to converting the Section 4(f) land to a different function. Any such requirements must be satisfied, independent of the Section 4(f) approval.

§ 774.7 Documentation.

(a) A Section 4(f) evaluation prepared under § 774.3(a) shall include sufficient supporting documentation to demonstrate why there is no feasible and prudent avoidance alternative and shall summarize the results of all pos-

sible planning to minimize harm to the Section 4(f) property.

(b) A *de minimis* impact determination under § 774.3(b) shall include sufficient supporting documentation to demonstrate that the impacts, after avoidance, minimization, mitigation, or enhancement measures are taken into account, are *de minimis* as defined in § 774.17; and that the coordination required in § 774.5(b) has been completed.

(c) If there is no feasible and prudent avoidance alternative the Administration may approve only the alternative that causes the least overall harm in accordance with § 774.3(c). This analysis must be documented in the Section 4(f) evaluation.

(d) The Administration shall review all Section 4(f) approvals under §§ 774.3(a) and 774.3(c) for legal sufficiency.

(e) A Section 4(f) approval may involve different levels of detail where the Section 4(f) involvement is addressed in a tiered EIS under § 771.111(g) of this chapter.

(1) When the first-tier, broad-scale EIS is prepared, the detailed information necessary to complete the Section 4(f) approval may not be available at that stage in the development of the action. In such cases, the documentation should address the potential impacts that a proposed action will have on Section 4(f) property and whether those impacts could have a bearing on the decision to be made. A preliminary Section 4(f) approval may be made at this time as to whether the impacts resulting from the use of a Section 4(f) property are *de minimis* or whether there are feasible and prudent avoidance alternatives. This preliminary approval shall include all possible planning to minimize harm to the extent that the level of detail available at the first-tier EIS stage allows. It is recognized that such planning at this stage may be limited to ensuring that opportunities to minimize harm at subsequent stages in the development process have not been precluded by decisions made at the first-tier stage. This preliminary Section 4(f) approval is then incorporated into the first-tier EIS.

(2) The Section 4(f) approval will be finalized in the second-tier study. If no